REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-9 have been pending in the application.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-5, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Walker et al. (U.S. 6,390,917).

Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker.

According to the foregoing, the claims are amended, claim 2 is cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice, and thus, claims 1 and 3-9 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added. The foregoing rejections are hereby traversed.

REJECTIONS

The Office Action maintains from the previous Office Action the anticipatory rejection of claims 1-9 over Walker (US Patent No. 6,390,917).

However, claim 1-9 are newly rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the expression "directly," newly added to the claims in the previous Amendment.

Office Action pages 5-6, items 9-13, is the response to arguments. The Office Action page 6, item 12 alleges "Walker ... server 12 includes transaction processor subroutine for providing services for connected slot machines and to processes input signals from the players at the respective slot machine, that is the control of the slot machines is based on the system resources in the server." Although Walker in column 3, lines 27-36, discusses a server "transaction processor subroutine [42] further processes input signals from the players at the respective slot machines," Walker fails to disclose or suggest how the server 12's transaction processor subroutine 42 processes the input signals from a slot machine. In other words, the claimed present invention does not simply recite a server to process a command input via an I/O device of a client, which is a typical client-server processing configuration. Walker discusses

conventional client-server processing to provide interactive marketing and user response facilities for gaming machines (column 1, lines 1-16 and column 2, lines 26-45).

Further, the Office Action page 6, item 13, alleges Walker's client display device control 50 in the slot machine client 14 is similar to the claimed present invention's, "client ... device handler" 26. However, Walker fails to disclose or suggest how the display device control 50 interacts with the server 12. Accordingly, Walker enables only a conventional display device control 50 in which device driver for the interactive display device 22 resides in the slot machine client 14, and Walker fails to provide an enabling disclosure to anticipatorily reject the claimed present invention's "***server ... device driver*** ... ***for the client-side I/O device***." The Office Action alleges Walker's transaction processor 42 can meet the claimed present invention's, "***server ... device driver***," but it is readily apparent that a "***device driver***" drives or provides an input/output control interface to an input/output port of a device connected at a client, such as a display or bar code reader (dependent claim 6), but differs from Walker's transaction processor 42 that receives and transmits data from/to the client slot machine 14.

In other words, Walker's server transaction processor 42, located in the server, does not provide an input/output control interface to an input/output port of the display module 22, but the client display device control 50, located in the client slot machine 14, provides the interface to the display device 22, which is conventional. Walker's column 3, lines 34-36 discusses a server "transaction processor subroutine [42] further processes ***input signals from the players at the respective slot machines***," however, in view of Walker's FIGS. 2 and 6, it is readily apparent that "input signals from ... slot machines," refers to data input at the client slot machine 14 via the display device 22, but fails to disclose or suggest anywhere to provide the claimed present invention's, "***server ... device driver*** ... ***for the client-side I/O device***" as ***an input/output control interface, located in a server, to an input/output port of a device connectable at a client***.

Further, the Office Action regarding claim 1 alleges Walker's FIG. 2, Comm. Port 36, can meet the claimed present invention's, "***server ... virtual I/O port ... for the client-side I/O device***." However, according to Walker FIG. 2 and column 3, lines 34-36, the Comm. Port 36 is at the server and is "a communication port 36 which provides interconnection to bus system 20 (via slot machine interface 38)." In Walker (FIG. 1), the bus system 20 connects the slot server 12 to the client slot machine 14. Therefore, it is readily apparent Walker's Comm. Port 36 is at

the server 12 to be an I/O port to the client slot machine 14, but not an I/O port to the I/O device of the client slot machine 14, such as the display control module 22.

Independent claims 1, 3, 4, and 9, using claim 1 as an example, are amended for clarity, taking into consideration the Examiner comments, as follows:

> 1. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A client/server system comprising:
>
> a server, comprising:
>
> software to generate operating instructions for a client-side I/O device;
>
> a device driver to function at the server as a client-side device driver for input-output control of a client-side I/O port, ~~to generate a control signal for the client-side I/O device~~ based on the operating instructions from the software; and
>
> a virtual I/O port to function at the server as a client-side I/O port interface to the device driver by transmitting an input-output~~directly transmit the~~ control received from the device driver and informing the device driver of a received client-side I/O device event ~~signal for the client-side I/O device and to directly receive an I/O event from the client-side I/O device, to directly control the client-side I/O device~~; and
>
> a client communicably connectable with the server and communicably connectable with the client-side I/O device, the client ~~in communication with the client-side I/O device,~~ comprising:
>
> a client-side device handler to ~~directly receive~~ receive the input-output control from ~~the server the control signal from~~ the virtual I/O port in the server and to transmit the client-side I/O device event to the server virtual I/O port, and
>
> a client-side I/O port to control the client-side I/O device according to an input-output control from the client-side device handler ~~based upon system resources in the server, and to directly transmit the I/O event received from the client-side I/O device to the virtual I/O port in the server~~.

Dependent claim 2 is cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice.

The claimed present invention's data-flow between a server application 10 and an I/O device 4 connected to a client 2, as discussed in page 17, line 6 to page 18, line 20 and FIGS. 3 and 4 of the present Application, differs from Walker, because Walker fails to disclose or suggest the claimed present invention's, "***a server ... device driver to function at the server as a client-side device driver for input-output control of a client-side I/O port***" and "***a server ...***

virtual I/O port to function at the server as a client-side I/O port interface to the device driver by transmitting an input-output~~directly transmit the~~ control received from the device driver and informing the device driver of a received client-side I/O device event." Walker is silent on any type of "***a server ...device driver ... as a client-side device driver for input-output control of a client-side I/O port***, because Walker's server 12's transaction processor 42 is not "***a device driver***." Further, Walker is silent on or fails to provide an enabling disclosure or suggestion of any type of "***a server ... virtual I/O port ... as a client-side I/O port interface to the device driver by transmitting an input-output~~directly transmit the~~ control received from the device driver and informing the device driver of a received client-side I/O device event***," because the Office Action page 4, item 1, in rejecting claim 1, alleges Walker's server Comm. Port 36 to be a virtual I/O port, but server 12 Comm. Port 36 is for the server 12 to connect on the bus 20 with the client slot machine 14, so Comm. Port 36 is not for connecting to the client 14 display device 22.

Further, Walker's is silent on details of client display device control 50, so Walker fails to provide an enabling disclosure or suggestion of "***a client-side device handler to ~~directly receive~~ receive the input-output control from ~~the server the control signal from~~ the virtual I/O port in the server and to transmit the client-side I/O device event to the server virtual I/O port***," because Walker fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, "***a server ... virtual I/O port ... as a client-side I/O port interface to the device driver by transmitting an input-output~~directly transmit the~~ control received from the device driver and informing the device driver of a received client-side I/O device event***."

Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, in the present Application FIGS. 3 and 4, and page 17, line 6 to page 18, line 20.

Walker cannot anticipate the claimed present invention, because Walker fails to disclose or suggest, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of the claimed present invention, such as "***a server ...device driver ... as a client-side device driver for input-output control of a client-side I/O port***," and "***a server ... virtual I/O port ... as a client-side I/O port interface to the device driver by transmitting an input-output~~directly transmit the~~ control received from the device driver and informing the device driver of a received client-side I/O device event***."

In view of the claim amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejection of pending

claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 2, 2006

By: _____
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501